

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

BRAD MICKELSEN,

Plaintiff,

v.

GROWLIFE, INC., et al.,

Defendants.

No. 2:20-cv-01855-MCE-CKD

ORDER

Presently before the Court is Plaintiff Brad Mickelsen's ("Plaintiff") Motion for Summary Judgment, which Defendant Growlife, Inc. ("Defendant") opposes. See ECF No. 79 (seeking summary judgment on the breach of contract claim only). However, Plaintiff's Motion does not contain any legal or factual analysis whatsoever. See id. at 9. Instead, he simply lists each element of a breach of contract claim and refers to supposedly supporting provisions in his declaration. His Separate Statement of Undisputed Material Facts then simply refers to the same declaration provisions. This is wholly deficient, especially since Defendant's Opposition raises numerous arguments and Plaintiff's Reply is more detailed than his actual Motion.

Accordingly, Plaintiff's Motion for Summary Judgment, ECF No. 79, is DENIED without prejudice. Not later than thirty (30) days from the date this Order is electronically filed, Plaintiff may file a renewed Motion for Summary Judgment that conforms with the

1 applicable Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and Local Rules of this Court. The
2 opposition and reply briefs shall be filed in accordance with the deadlines set forth in the
3 Local Rules.

4 IT IS SO ORDERED.

5 Dated: August 29, 2023

6 
7 MORRISON C. ENGLAND, JR.
8 SENIOR UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28